

From: [OMEALY Mikell](#)
To: [Benjamin Shorr](#); [Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [Jeremy Buck](#); [Joe Goulet/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [PETERSON Jenn L](#); [PJ Bridgen](#); [Robert.Neely@noaa.gov](#); [Valerie Lee](#); [Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [Burt Shephard/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [PALMERI Jordan](#)
Subject: FW: Portland Harbor CSM
Date: 09/16/2005 03:42 PM
Attachments: [Portland Harbor draft EcoCSM.xls](#)
[9.19.05.Eco Team Meeting agenda.doc](#)
[foodchain3.jpg](#)
[Conceptual aquatic food web.gif](#)

Thanks very much for your work on this, Burt.

All - attached is an agenda for Monday's meeting. Please take a look at this before our meeting and if possible, spend some time reviewing Burt's attached models, Figure 2-1 and Table 2-1 from the LWG's 9/9/05 PRE, and Figures 5-4 and 5-5 from the LWG's 4/23/04 PH Workplan. Bring your copies with you to the meeting, along with your ideas for how the LWG's models need to be changed.

If anyone has questions before the meeting, please let me know.

Thanks,
Mikell

-----Original Message-----

From: Shephard.Burt@epamail.epa.gov
[mailto:Shephard.Burt@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Friday, September 16, 2005 11:52 AM
To: OMEALY Mikell
Cc: Benjamin Shorr; Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov; Jeremy Buck; Goulet.Joe@epamail.epa.gov; OMEALY Mikell; PETERSON Jenn L; PJ Bridgen; Robert.Neely@noaa.gov; Valerie Lee; Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov; Humphrey.Chip@epamail.epa.gov
Subject: RE: Portland Harbor CSM

Helo all,

Attached is the most recent version of the Portland Harbor CSM I've come up with. I've modified the fate and transport section to correctly identify how groundwater and transition zone water is being addressed, and modified the general categories of ecological receptors to reflect what's present in the harbor. I deliberately haven't changed the sources of contaminants to the harbor, thinking we should have agreement on the sources of contamination that the RI/FS process can actually address via during remediation or monitored natural attenuation.

My quick take on the updated CSM that the LWG presented in the PRE is that its description of ecological receptors is better than mine, and should be kept with any appropriate modifications. Their fate and transport section is still very weak, and doesn't link upland sources to the river. It also lacks some appropriate exposure media to evaluate (e.g. soil). This is one area I think we're ahead of LWG, thinking of the site as a whole, then working down to what's needed at individual sites, while keeping in mind how an individual site remediation affects the system as a whole.

Best regards,

Burt Shephard
Risk Evaluation Unit
Office of Environmental Assessment (OEA-095)
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10
1200 6th Avenue
Seattle, WA 98101

Telephone: (206) 553-6359
Fax: (206) 553-0119

e-mail: Shephard.Burt@epa.gov

(See attached file: Portland Harbor draft EcoCSM.xls)